



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09 817,241	03 27 2001	Kunio Ikui	SON-2068	8038

23353 7590 03 26 2003
RADER FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC
LION BUILDING
1233 20TH STREET N.W., SUITE 501
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER
LEURIG, SHARLENE L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2879	

DATE MAILED: 03/26/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/817,241	IKUI ET AL.
	Examiner Sharlene Leurig	Art Unit 2879

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 January 2003.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 27 March 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The Amendment, filed on January 13, 2003, has been entered and acknowledged by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1, 5, 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being patented by Tamura (5,025,490) (of record). Regarding claims 1 and 7, Tamura discloses a display screen (7) with a stacked film attached to its front surface, the stacked film consisting in sequence a base layer (8), a hard coat layer formed of glass (1), a conductive film layer (2) and “an electrical insulating layer” (3), also known as a dielectric layer (column 1, lines 53-54). Tamura discloses a conductive adhesive tape including a conductive base of copper or aluminum coated with an electrical conductive bonding agent that serves as a conductive sticky layer with a specific electrical resistance (column 6, line 24). The sticky layer of the tape is connected to a grounded

"common potential line" (column 2, line 51) and the other end of the tape may be stuck directly onto the dielectric film (column 4, line 7).

Regarding claim 5, the conductive film has a typical sheet resistance of about "106 to 109Ω/□" which falls within the claimed range of 100-1KΩ/□ (column 7, line 8).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tamura (5,025,490) (of record). Tamura discloses a display screen with all the limitations discussed above, including conductive adhesive tape connecting the screen films to the tension band. However, Tamura does not specifically exemplify the sheet resistivity of the conductive tape's sticky layer as falling within the range of 10 Ω/cm² to 1K Ω/cm². However, the applicant's disclosure fails to show the range of 10 Ω/cm² to 1K Ω/cm² to solve any of the stated problems or yield any unexpected results that are not within the scope of the teachings applied. Consequently, the range of 10 Ω/cm² to 1K Ω/cm² is considered to be an obvious matter of design choice.

7. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tamura (5,025,490) (of record) in view of Hirasawa et al. (5,757,117) (of record). Tamura discloses a display screen with all the limitations discussed above and additionally discloses the use of a graphite electrode that is connected to the tension band via the conductive tape to prevent electrical damage to the conductive film (column 2, line 5 and column 5, lines 33-37).

Hirasawa teaches the use of a conductive graphite paste between the tape and the film layers to protect the conductive film (column 2, line 60). Hirasawa also teaches the alternative location of the graphite "conductive filler," namely on "the silicone adhesive (or conductive tape)" (column 4, line 42). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Tamura's display screen with a conductive tape having a graphite (carbon) filler in order to more cheaply create a capacitor that will protect the conductive film on the display screen from breakage due to high voltage discharge.

8. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tamura (5,025,490) (of record) in view of Biornard (5,091,244) (of record). Tamura discloses a display screen with an anti-reflective film but lacks a specific range of thickness associated with this film. However, it is common knowledge in the art that the anti-reflective films should be relatively thin to achieve the desired optical properties. Biornard teaches several anti-reflective films for a video display terminal in Tables 3-11, all of which have thicknesses that fall within the range of 10-250 nm, depending on the optical properties desired. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill

in the art at the time of the invention to modify Tamura's display screen with an anti-reflective film having a specified thickness within the range of 10-250 nm in order to achieve certain desired optical properties.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed on January 13, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claim 1, the applicant argues that Tamura '490 lacks disclosure of the claimed limitations because it fails to recite each and every limitation. The Examiner disagrees and holds that Tamura does indeed disclose each and every limitation of the independent claim. Specifically, the applicant argues that "Tamura '490 discloses a transparent electrical conducting layer 1 between the bonding agent 8 and the transparent electrically conductive layer 2." This argument is incoherent in light of the preceding list of components arranged by the applicant in which layer 1 is described as a transparent, electrically insulating layer. However, the Examiner will interpret the argument quoted above as meaning that layer 1 is electrically insulating. Nowhere in the applicant's claim is the hard coat layer further limited as not being an electrically insulating layer. Furthermore, due to the broad descriptions of the claimed components of the stacked film and because the claims do not include limitations of the materials comprising each layer, layer 8 formed of resin can be considered to be a "base layer" since it is on the bottom of the stack and layer 1 formed of glass can be considered to

be a "hard coat layer" since glass is hard. Therefore Tamura does disclose each and every limitation of claim 1 and therefore anticipates the claim.

The Examiner holds that claims 5 and 6 are also anticipated by Tamura.

Examiner also holds that dependent claims 2-6 are rejected as being dependent on a rejected base claim as well as being obvious over Tamura (5,025,490) in the case of claim 2 and as being obvious over Tamura (5,025,490) in view of Hirasawa et al. (5,757,117) for claim 3 and over Tamura (5,025,490) in view of Biornard (5,091,244) for claim 4.

Conclusion

2. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sharlene Leurig whose telephone number is (703)305-4745. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimesh Patel can be reached on (703)305-4794. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)308-7382 for regular communications and (703)308-7382 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-0956.

Sharlene Leurig
March 20, 2003

SL

SL
NIMESHKUMAR D. PATEL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800